Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 8 1994
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 93-1577

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1994

QUALITEX COMPANY,

Petitioner,

v.

JACOBSON PRODUCTS CO., INC.,

Respondent.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOINT APPENDIX

Donald G. Mulack, Esq.*
Christopher A. Bloom, Esq.
Edward J. Chalfie, Esq.
Heather C. Steinmeyer, Esq.
Keck, Mahin & Cate
77 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 634-7700

Counsel for Petitioner

Laurence D. Strick, Esq.
Law Offices of Laurence D. Strick
415 N. Camden Drive
Suite 207M
Beverly Hills, California 90210
(310) 278-6049

Counsel for Respondent

*Counsel of Record

November 8, 1994

PETITION FOR CERTIORARI FILED APRIL 4, 1994
CERTIORARI GRANTED SEPTEMBER 26, 1994

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

40 pp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPENDIX A -- Chronological List of Relevant Docket Entries:

- United States District Court for the Central District of California, Case No. CV 90 1183 HLH 1a

- United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Appeal No. 91-56260 . . . . . 2a

APPENDIX B - Trial Exhibit 80, admitted by stipulation pursuant to Pre-Trial Conference Order filed with the District Court May 10, 1991 . . . . . 4a

APPENDIX C - Trial Exhibit 18, admitted by stipulation pursuant to Pre-Trial Conference Order filed within the District Court May 10, 1991 . . . . . 5a

APPENDIX D - District Court's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, entered September 3, 1991 . . . . . 6a

APPENDIX E - Judgment of the District Court, entered September 3, 1991 . . . . . 21a

APPENDIX F - Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, entered January 3, 1994 . . . . . 23a

APPENDIX G - Revised Judgment of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, entered June 10, 1994 . . . . . 37a

APPENDIX H - Order of the United States Supreme Court Granting Certiorari, entered September 23, 1994 . . . . . 39a

APPENDIX A - CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF RELEVANT DOCKET ENTRIES

The District Court:

Date	NR	Proceedings
1990		
Mar. 9	1	COMPLAINT for Injunction, Damages, and other Relief.
Apr. 10	5	ANSWER to Complaint.
1991		
Apr. 2	37	SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT for Injunction, Damages, and Other Relief.
11	40	COUNTERCLAIM on Behalf of Jacobson Products Co., Inc. for Cancellation of Trademark and Declaratory Relief.
24	56	REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIM.
May 10	64	PRETRIAL CONFERENCE ORDER.
Jun. 4	65	PLAINTIFF'S TRIAL BRIEF.
	66	DEFENDANT'S TRIAL BRIEF.
20	69	MINUTES of Civil Trial of 6/20/91, Trial Cont. Until 6/21/91.
21	85	MINUTES of Civil Trial of 6/20/91.
Sept. 3	92	FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.
	93	JUDGMENT in favor of Plaintiff.

Date	NR	Proceedings
Sept. 23	95	DEFENDANT'S Notice of Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
1994		
Jun. 10	102	REVISED JUDGMENT of the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

The Ninth Circuit:

Date	Proceedings and Orders
1992	
Mar. 17	OPENING BRIEF of Defendant-Appellant Jacobson Products Co., Inc. and Excerpts of Record.
Apr. 20	BRIEF of Plaintiff-Appellee Qualitex Company and Supplemental Excerpts of Record.
May 5	REPLY BRIEF of Defendant-Appellant Jacobson Products Co., Inc.
1993	
Feb. 2	APPEAL ARGUED and Submitted to Proctor R. Hugg, Warren F. Ferguson, and Diarmuid F. O'Scannlain.
1994	
Jan. 3	OPINION of Ninth Circuit Filed and Judgment Entered.

Date	Proceedings and Orders
Jan. 21	MOTION TO STAY Mandate Pending Filing of Petition for Certiorari by Qualitex Company.
27	ORDER Entered Denying Motion to Stay.
Mar. 3	MANDATE ISSUED.

APPENDIX B - TRIAL EXHIBIT 80, ADMMITTED BY STIPULATION PURSUANT TO PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE ORDER FILED WITHIN THE DISTRICT COURT DATED MAY 10, 1991

APPENDIX C - TRIAL EXHIBIT 18, ADMITTED BY STIPULATION PURSUANT TO PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE ORDER FILED WITHIN THE DISTRICT COURT DATED MAY 10, 1991

APPENDIX D - DISTRICT COURT'S FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, ENTERED SEPTEMBER 3, 1991

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

QUALITEX COMPANY, an Illinois corporation,	)	
Plaintiff and Counterdefendant,	)	No. CV 1183 HLH(JRX)
vs.	)	
JACOBSON PRODUCTS COMPANY, INCORPORATED, a California corporation,	)	FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Defendant and Counterdefendant.	)	

The court finds and concludes as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Qualitex is a closely held family company that has been engaged since 1945 in the manufacture of various products for dry cleaners, laundries and garment manufacturers which it sells through various independent distributors in the United States.

2. Qualitex began manufacturing and selling its SUN GLOW® press pad in approximately 1957 for use on dry cleaning presses.

3. The SUN GLOW® pad is constructed in various sizes from differing lengths of rubber, fiberglass and insulating materials with a bottom cloth.

4. The SUN GLOW® pad is covered on top with a specially woven fabric made to Qualitex' specifications and treated with a special formulation of resins and other chemicals to resist heat and increase wear.

5. Qualitex selected the unique green-gold color, specially dyed its fabric, and instructed its fabric finisher to use the same color on all fabric for use on SUN GLOW® press pads. The color is technically described as "brass #6587."

6. Qualitex has sold its press pads in the same green-gold color cover fabric for over 30 years.

7. The green-gold color for use on press pads was registered as a trademark in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on February 5, 1991 as Registration No. 1,633,711.

8. The "SUN GLOW®" trademark was registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on February 17, 1959 as Registration No. 674,153 and is presumptively valid.

9. The relevant purchasing public for press pads sold by Qualitex and Jacobson, and other competitors, are dry cleaning businesses and garment manufacturers.

10. Most dry cleaning businesses are small, family owned, and family run establishments, many of whom are foreign speaking with limited skills in reading or speaking English.

11. Approximately 30% of the dry cleaning establishments in this country are run by Koreans. Of the 1,000 dry cleaning plants in the Chicagoland area, 70% are owned or operated by Koreans.

12. The quality of the Qualitex press pad is known to be the best in the business.

Secondary Meaning

13. From at least 1960 to the present time Qualitex advertised its press pad on a monthly basis in the American Drycleaner Magazine, the leading trade

publication. Since at least 1970, the color ads featured the green-gold SUN GLOW® press pad. No other advertiser ever ran an ad with that color. Readers associate the color with Qualitex.

14. Qualitex also places ads featuring its green-gold press pad in the Korean Drycleaners Times, the Drycleaners News, the Bobbin, and the Agent magazines which are distributed regularly to the dry cleaning and garment industries.

15. Qualitex has prepared Bulletins which advertise the SUN GLOW® press pad in the green-gold color, distributes flyers at trade shows and uses various brochures and mailers both in English and Korean promoting its green-gold color. Qualitex also drapes its booths at trade shows with green-gold cover material to further associate the color with Qualitex.

16. From 1960 through September 30, 1990 Qualitex has expended approximately $1,621,000 for advertising the green-gold color of the SUN GLOW® pad and to promote it at trade shows.

17. Over the past 30 years, Qualitex has sold over one million SUN GLOW® press pads bearing the green-gold color.

18. Nineteen out of twenty-two award winning dry cleaners according to the *American Drycleaner* magazine, have used the Qualitex press pad for the last twenty years.

19. As a result of the long and exclusive use of its green-gold color in the marketplace Qualitex' SUN GLOW® pad has acquired distinctiveness or secondary meaning.

20. Some purchasers of press pads have come to identify and order Qualitex press pads over the telephone by merely describing its color.

21. For decades, other manufacturers have used the colors lime green, grey, dark green, light blue, orange,peach, blue/grey and other colors on their press pads.

Intent to Copy

22. Jacobson has been in business since 1951 and supplies approximately 600 products to the dry cleaning and garment industry through 450-500 distributors. Jacobson manufactures a press pad known as the "Magic Glow" pad. The "Magic Glow" pad is constructed in various sizes from differing lengths of rubber, fiberglass and insulating materials with a bottom cloth.

23. Jacobson first began supplying press pads manufactured by Bishop Freeman Company in 1988. Jacobson has sold approximately 400 "Bishopads" in a dark green color, and 50-100 "Cushntop" pads in a two-tone grey/green color since 1988.

24. The materials in the Bishopad manufactured by Bishop Freeman are inferior to the materials in the Qualitex pad.

25. Prior to June, 1989 Qualitex was the only company that sold press pads for use in the dry cleaning and garment industries in the green-gold color made the subject matter of the present law suit.

26. When Jacobson decided to manufacture its own Magic Glow press pad, it contacted the president of Zellermayer Corporation at a Dallas, Texas trade show in March, 1989 to purchase cover material. A color swatch of Qualitex material was shown and Zellermayer was asked if that material could be obtained.

27. The parties discussed that the material was the same color as Qualitex, and Jacobson's president said that he wanted the Qualitex material for use in foreign markets. Zellermayer's president said he didn't believe he would have sold the Qualitex material to Jacobson if he knew it was to be used to copy the Qualitex press pad.

28. Jacobson purchased 700 yards of Qualitex green-gold "seconds" material in April, 1989 from Zellermayer Corporation in New York. Zellermayer had purchased the material from Amerbelle Corporation, the fabric finisher utilized by Qualitex.

29. The initial shipment of material to Jacobson consisted of overrun "seconds" material from an earlier Qualitex production run which Jacobson didn't like but nevertheless used to make "Magic Glow" pads.

30. After exhausting the initial 700 yards of Qualitex green-gold "seconds material," Zellermayer was unable to purchase additional Qualitex material for Jacobson based upon Amerbelle's claim that the green-gold color ("brass #6587") was exclusive to Qualitex.

31. Jacobson used a list of 200 mills nationwide to locate a supplier who would specially mix and provide the identical color of a material that Qualitex was using.

32. Jacobson then contacted Qualitex' fabric supplier, Brookwood Roll Goods, Inc. to purchase more Qualitex green-gold material but said request was refused.

33. Jacobson thereafter went to United Textile & Supply Company ("Unitex") with a sample swatch of the Qualitex material and asked that the material and color be duplicated.

34. The green-gold color was not a shelf item and had to be manufactured especially for Jacobson.

35. Jacobson purchased additional green-gold material from Unitex, after requesting that Unitex send a swatch of Qualitex material to an outside lab for testing of its composition, and ultimate duplication, leading to the successful imitation of the Qualitex green-gold color.

36. On January 24, 1990 Jacobson placed its first order for cover material with Unitex and a total of 5,096 yards of green-gold material was ultimately shipped to Jacobson by Unitex.

37. Jacobson first sold green-gold Magic Glow press pads to the industry at least as early as July, 1989.

38. Jacobson intentionally copied the overall look of Qualitex' green-gold press pad and one-half of the SUN GLOW® trademark.

Likelihood of Confusion

39. The Magic Glow press pad is an inferior quality to the Qualitex SUN GLOW® pad.

40. The components of the Jacobson pad are inferior to the Qualitex pad and the Jacobson pad will not last for 10 months like the Qualitex pad.

41. *Cover Cloth*. Qualitex cover cloth is constructed of 210 denier industrial yarn which is stronger and lasts longer than the 200 denier wearing apparel yarn used by Jacobson.

42. *Rubber*. Qualitex uses a 55 lb. rubber which is a heavier weight than the 33 lb. rubber used by Jacobson in its press pad.

43. *Fiberglass*. Qualitex uses a long-strand fiberglass which has an ability to dissipate heat quicker without deterioration than the short-strand fiberglass used by Jacobson.

44. *Bottom Cloth*. Qualitex uses a heavier weight white bottom cloth on its press pad which will last longer than the lighter weight bottom cloth used by Jacobson.

45. Qualitex and Jacobson are direct competitors, and they market their products through the same channels. Both sell to distributors who then sell to the dry cleaning and garment industries. Some distributors sell both Qualitex and Jacobson products.

46. Qualitex and Jacobson utilize the same advertising medium to promote their products. Both advertise in trade journals and other periodicals directed to dry cleaning and garment businesses.

47. Jacobson is selling its pad to distributors as a "look alike" Qualitex pad. One distributor sold Jacobson pads to customers who ordered Qualitex pads because he thought the customer wouldn't know the difference. One such customer returned the Jacobson pad and requested a Qualitex pad.

48. *Survey Evidence*. Personal interviews were conducted of 199 men and women in dry cleaner stores during the months of November and December, 1990 in four locations: Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia. Each respondent was shown a Jacobson press pad and asked: "What company or companies do you think makes this press pad?" 39% of the respondents answered Qualitex. Not one respondent named Jacobson. When asked: "What is it that makes you think [Qualitex] makes this press pad?" Numerous respondents stated the "color."

49. The sale of Jacobson's Magic Glow press pad has created the likelihood of confusion, deception or mistake in the marketplace.

Non-functionality -- Competitive Need

50. The natural color of the cordura and 210 denier yarn used in the Qualitex cover material is yellowed off-white.

51. Qualitex uses the ornamental green-gold dye to associate that color to its "SUN GLOW®" press pads.

52. Green-gold color dye on the cover material of a press paid does not make the press pad perform better. The color itself does not affect the quality of the goods one way or another.

53. Color itself makes the press pad more pleasing in appearance and only makes it look better.

54. The green-gold color dye for cover material is more expensive than other colors.

55. The use of the green-gold color does not make the press pad last longer.

56. Qualitex' green-gold color is a-non-primary color, and is merely a shade of green.

57. There is no competitive need in the press pad industry for the green-gold color, since other colors are equally usable.

58. There is a competitive need in the press pad industry for color, but the range of tones of available

distinctive suitable colors, which need not be primary colors, is in the hundreds, if not thousands.

Damages

59. The press pads sold by Qualitex and Jacobson to distributors have a retail price range from $13.00 to $195.00. The average range is $38.00 to $55.00.

60. Through December, 1990 Bishop Freeman Company manufactured 1,671 Magic Glow press pads for Jacobson in the green-gold color. At time of trial about 300 remained in inventory. The court concludes that approximately 1,371 were sold.

61. Jacobson sold Magic Glow press pads to the industry at an average price of $24.00 per pad.

62. Jacobson had actual notice of Qualitex' federal registration of the green-gold color for press pads at least as early as March 4, 1991.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Infringement of Registered Trademark

1. In order to succeed on its registered trademark claim, Qualitex must prove that (1) it possesses a valid trademark, and (2) that Jacobson's use of a similar mark is likely to cause confusion, mistake or deception in the marketplace. *Charles Schwab & Co. Inc. v. Hibernia Bank*, 665 F. Supp. 800, 803 (N.D. Cal. 1987).

2. Qualitex has a valid trademark registered on the Principal Register of the Patent and Trademark Office for the green-gold mark which is the subject of Registration No. 1,633,711, issued February 5, 1991.

3. The certificate No. 1,633,711 issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office is *prima facie* evidence of: (i) the validity of the Qualitex' registered mark, (ii) of Qualitex' ownership of the mark, and (iii) of Qualitex' exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods specified in

the certificate, subject to any conditions or limitations stated in said certificate. 15 U.S.C. § 1057(b).

4. The burden is on Jacobson to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Qualitex' federal registration is invalid -- 578 F.2d 295, 301 (CCPA, 1978).

5. Jacobson has failed to meet its burden to prove that Qualitex' trademark Registration No. 1,633,711 is invalid and therefore the relief requested in the Counterclaim to cancel said Registration is denied.

6. The sale of Jacobson's press pad in the substantially similar green-gold color as Qualitex' registered trademark has created a likelihood of confusion, deception or mistake in the marketplace.

7. By selling a press pad in the substantially similar green-gold color Jacobson has infringed Qualitex registered trademark No. 1,633,711 issued February 5, 1991 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

8. In recognizing the trademark as valid, there is no danger of "color depletion." There are hundreds or thousands of distinctive shades of greens, yellows, blues, and browns or tans available to the competitors without danger that recognizing plaintiff's trademark will hinder competition.

Unfair Competition

9. The protection against unfair competition afforded by Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act covers a broad range of actionable harms. *Inwood Laboratories v. Ives Laboratories*, 456 U.S. 844, 858 (1982). This section was designed to create a cause of action beyond simple trademark infringement of the pe arising under Section 32 of the Act. *Id.*; *SK&F. Co. v. Premo Pharmaceutical Lab.*, 625 F.2d 1055, 1065 (3d Cir. 1980).

10. The "ultimate test" of unfair competition in the Ninth Circuit is whether consumer confusion or deception is likely as a result of the defendant's acts.

Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sullivan, 846 F.2d 1175, 1178 (9th Cir. 1988).

11. Trademark infringement is but one species of the far broader law of unfair competition. McKenney & Long, *Federal Unfair Competition: Lanham Act Section 43(a)*, Section 3.01, p. 3-10 (1990). The Lanham Act's statement of what constitutes unfair competition and false designation of origin does not state any requirement that a protectable trademark be at issue.

12. *Degree Of Care*. Korean and other foreign speaking purchasers of press pads are unlikely to exercise a sufficiently high degree of care to avoid purchasing a Jacobson pad when they are shown a green-gold pad which they naturally assume to be the Qualitex pad that they have come to recognize. The law protects such purchasers.

> The law, however, protects not only the intelligent, the experienced, and the astute. It safeguards from deception also the ignorant, the inexperienced, and the gullible.

Stork Restaurant Inc. v. Sahati, 166 F.2d 348, 359 (9th Cir. 1948)."

13. *Intent*. Jacobson's use of Qualitex' green-gold color is intended to trade off of the goodwill that Qualitex has developed in its green-gold trademark. Evidence of such an intention is strong evidence of a likelihood of confusion, deception or mistake. *Vision Sports, Inc. v. Melville Corp.*, 888 F.2d 609, 616 (9th Cir. 1989); *Fuddruckers, Inc. v. Doc's B.R. Others, Inc.*, 826 F.2d 837, 845-46 (9th Cir. 1987).

14. The press pad survey conducted by Elrick & Lavidge demonstrates that 39% of the respondents, when shown the Jacobson pad, believed it to be a Qualitex pad. The survey's findings are significant evidence that people who purchase press pads are likely to be confused, mistaken

or deceived when they see or encounter the accused Jacobson pad in the marketplace.

15. Surveys of the type conducted on behalf of Qualitex are relevant evidence on the issue of likelihood of confusion. *James Burrough, Ltd. v. Sign of Beefeater, Inc.*, 540 F.2d 266 (7th Cir. 1976) (15% "probative"); *RJR Foods, Inc. v. White Rock*, 603 F2d 1058 (2d Cir. 1979) (15%-20% "corroborative"); *Exxon Corp. v. Texas Motor Exchange, Inc.*, 628 F.2d 500 (5th Cir. 1980) (15%, 23% "strong evidence of likelihood of confusion").

16. Jacobson is guilty of unfair competition under Section 43(a) of The Lanham Act as stated in Count II of the Complaint by (1) copying the appearance of the SUN GLOW pad and deceiving purchasers, (2) putting an inferior product into the marketplace under Qualitex' distinctive trade dress to the detriment of said purchasers and Qualitex, and (3) infringing Qualitex' registered trademark for the green-gold color for use on press pads.

Trade Dress

17. "A product's trade dress attains secondary meaning when the purchasing public associates the dress with a single producer or source rather than just the product itself." *First Brands Corp. v. Fred Meyer, Inc.*, 809 F.2d 1378, 1383 (9th Cir. 1987).

18. The duration of its exclusive use of the green-gold color on its press pad, the significant amount of sales for over 30 years, and the "image advertising" of the pad by Qualitex, including consumers' awareness of that advertising as stated above, all demonstrate that the Qualitex press pad has acquired secondary meaning.

19. "[P]roof of copying strongly supports an inference of secondary meaning." *Vision Sports, Inc. v. Melville Corp.*, 888 F.2d 609, 615 (9th Cir. 1989). *Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp.*, 768 F.2d 1001, 1016 (9th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1059 (1986).

20. "In this Circuit, the aesthetic functionality test has been limited, *Vuitton*...if not rejected, *Fabrica* ... in favor of the 'utilitarian' functionality test." *First Brands Corp v. Fred Meyer Inc.*, 809 F.2d 1378, 1382 n.3 (9th Cir. 1987).

21. Qualitex' green-gold mark is not functional. In determining functionality, a product's trade dress must be analyzed as a whole. *California Cooler, Inc. v. Loretto Winery, Ltd.*, 774 F.2d 1451, 1455 (9th Cir. 1985). "[A] product feature is functional if it is essential to the [product's] use ... or if it affects the cost or quality of the article." *Inwood Laboratories, Inc v. Ives laboratories, Inc.*, 456 U.S. 844, 850 n.10, 102 S.Ct. 2182, 2187 n.10 (1982).

22. Color is not an inherent attribute or natural characteristic of the press pad, but instead is a feature added by Qualitex and other manufacturers. The color is not added to make the product work better, it is only added as an ornamental or aesthetic adornment and to improve the appearance of the pad while being used.

23. The green-gold shade of color which distinguishes the Qualitex press pad that is being copied by Jacobson is not legally functional because it is not related in any way to the product's use, cost, quality or longevity.

24. Since Qualitex' green-gold color is not a primary or secondary color, its appropriation and exclusive use by Qualitex will not deprive competitors of the right to use a *primary color. First Brands Corp. v. Fred Meyer, Inc.*, 809 F.2d 1378 (9th Cir. 1987).

25. Non-primary color, akin to an overall surface design, can perform the function of a trademark when the other requirements of trademark law are met. *In re: Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp.*, 774 F.2d 1116 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

26. The total impression of the Qualitex green-gold pad and its "Sun Glow" name constitute the trade dress (overall appearance) of the Qualitex product. In order to prove that its trade dress has been infringed,

Qualitex must show that: (1) the trade dress is non-functional, (2) the trade dress has acquired secondary meaning, and (3) it is likely to be confused with the trade dress of Jacobson's product by consumers. *White Swan, Ltd. v. Clyde Robin Seed Co., Inc.*, 729 F. Supp. 1257, 1259 (N.D. Cal. 1989).

27. *Strength*. Qualitex' green-gold trademark is strong. The strength of the green-gold mark supports a finding of likelihood of confusion, deception or mistake when purchasers see the Jacobson pad.

28. *Confusion*. "It is not necessary to prove actual confusion in order for plaintiff to prevail." *Geoffrey, Inc. v. Stratton*, 16 USPQ2d 1691, 1696 (C.D. Cal. 1990).

29. Qualitex' green-gold color is non-functional under the Ninth Circuit's functionality law, and the appearance of the product has acquired secondary meaning among its consumers. The survey evidence shows that confusion between Qualitex' trade dress and the Jacobson knock-off named "Magic Glow" is likely. For these reasons, Qualitex is entitled to relief on the additional basis that Jacobson has infringed the Qualitex trade dress.

Relief

30. The facts in the present case are remarkably similar to those in *Owens-Corning* and therefore also constitute an "extraordinary" case to confirm trademark protection to the green-gold color for use on press pads.

31. Jacobson's Sixth Affirmative Defense on unclean hands is denied.

32. Qualitex is entitled to an injunction against Jacobson's infringement of the green-gold registered trademark pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116.

33. Qualitex is entitled to an injunction against Jacobson's unfair competition pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

34. Qualitex is entitled to an injunction against Jacobson's infringement of the trade dress of Qualitex Sun Glow press pads.

35. Jacobson is liable to Qualitex for the profits it made from its infringement in the amount of $8,208.13 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

36. While the copying was deliberate, it was done in a belief that plaintiff could not appropriate a color. In the state of the law at the time, this view was not unreasonable. Enhanced damages and attorneys' fees will not yet be awarded.

Adopted 9/3/91
Harry L. Hupp, U.S.D.J.

APPENDIX E - JUDGMENT OF THE DISTRICT COURT, ENTERED SEPTEMBER 3, 1991

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

QUALITEX COMPANY, an Illinois corporation,	)	
Plaintiff and Counterdefendant,	)	No. CV 90 1183 HLH(JRX)
vs.	)	
JACOBSON PRODUCTS COMPANY, INCORPORATED, a California corporation,	)	JUDGMENT
Defendant and Counterdefendant.	)	

THE COURT having heard and considered the evidence, deposition transcripts, and testimony at trial, having read and considered the Stipulations and Briefs of the respective parties,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

1. Judgment is entered in favor of the plaintiff and against the defendant on the Third Cause of Action in the Supplemental Complaint for infringement of plaintiffs registered trademark for the green-gold color on press pads. 15 U.S.C. § 1116.

2. Judgment is entered in favor of the plaintiff and against the defendant on defendant's Counterclaim for cancellation of the registered green-gold trademark.

3. Judgment is entered in favor of the plaintiff and against the defendant on the First and Second

Causes of Action for unfair competition under section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

4. Judgment is entered in favor of plaintiff and against the defendant in the amount of $8,208.13 representing the net profits made by defendant from the sale of the infringing Magic Glow pads, plus costs in the amount of $6,514.00.

5. The defendant Jacobson Products Company, its agents and employees and all those in active concert or participation with them, who have actual notice of this order, are hereby permanently enjoined from manufacturing, marketing or selling press pads made of any fabric using the same green-gold color of the Qualitex press pads, or so close to said color that it cannot be easily distinguished from the Qualitex color by the casual user.

Dated: Sept. 3, 1991

/s/ HARRY L. HUPP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPENDIX F - OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, ENTERED JANUARY 3, 1994

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

QUALITEX COMPANY,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

JACOBSON PRODUCTS COMPANY, INC.,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 91-56260.

Argued and Submitted Feb. 2, 1993.
Decided Jan. 3, 1994.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

Before HUG, FERGUSON, O'SCANNLAIN, Circuit Judges.

HUG, Circuit Judge:

The primary issue in this trademark and unfair competition case is whether color per se is protectable under the Lanham Act. This action involves a claim of trademark infringement and unfair competition. Qualitex Company ("Qualitex") contended that Jacobson Products Company, Inc. ("Jacobson") was manufacturing and selling green-gold press pads designed to look like the "SUN GLOW" pads that Qualitex had promoted and sold for over 30 years. Jacobson brought a counterclaim to declare invalid the Qualitex trademark for the color of its pads on the ground that a trademark could not be granted for color alone. The district court held Jacobson liable for damages from trademark infringement and unfair competition, and enjoined Jacobson from manufacturing, marketing, or

selling press pads of the same green-gold color as the pads marketed by Qualitex.

The district court's jurisdiction was based upon 15 U.S.C. §1121 and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a) and (b). We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm the judgment against Jacobson for unfair competition but hold that the Qualitex trademark for color alone is invalid.

I.

Qualitex, an Illinois corporation, manufactures and sells various products for dry cleaners, laundries and garment manufacturers. In 1957, Qualitex began manufacturing and selling its "SUN GLOW" press pad for use on dry cleaning presses. Qualitex's predecessor registered the trademark "SUN GLOW" with the United States Patent and Trademark Office in 1969. The fabric for the cover of the pad is a unique green-gold color.

Jacobson began manufacturing and marketing a "MAGIC GLOW" press pad in 1989. The cover is the same green-gold color as that of Qualitex's "SUN GLOW" pad, and the names of the pads are similar.

Qualitex initiated this action on March 9, 1990, by filing a complaint seeking injunctive relief and damages from Jacobson on the grounds that (1) Jacobson infringed Qualitex's trade dress in violation of Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act; and (2) Jacobson "passed off' its goods as those of Qualitex, and thus was guilty of unfair competition in violation of section 43 of the Lanham Act. During the pendency of this action, Qualitex filed for registration of the green-gold color. Registration was granted by the Patent and Trademark Office on February 5, 1991, and Qualitex added to its complaint the claim that Jacobson infringed Qualitex's federally registered trademark, in violation of Section 32(1) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1).

Jacobson argued that its actions were not prohibited by Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C.

§ 1125(a), as unfair competition. Further, Jacobson counterclaimed for the cancellation of Qualitex's registered trademark, arguing that no valid interest existed because color per se is not protectable; the color is functional and thus not protectable; no likelihood of confusion existed; and no secondary meaning was associated with Qualitex's trademark.

The evidence showed that readers of a trade publication associated the green-gold color with Qualitex, and that the "SUN GLOW" pad had acquired secondary meaning, as a result of its long and exclusive use by Qualitex. Jacobson admitted intentionally copying the overall look of Qualitex's green-gold press pad. The court concluded that the sale of the Jacobson pad had created the likelihood of confusion, deception or mistake in the marketplace. As to the green-gold color, the court found that the color did not affect the quality of the pads, and that there was no competitive need in the industry for the particular green-gold color. Although the court found a competitive need in the industry for color in general, the court noted that the range of tones available was "in the hundreds, if not thousands."

In its Conclusions of Law, the court held that Jacobson had infringed Qualitex's registered trademark and had failed to prove that the trademark was invalid. Jacobson was found guilty of unfair competition by copying the appearance of the "SUN GLOW" pad and deceiving purchasers, putting an inferior product into the marketplace under Qualitex's distinctive trade dress to the detriment of said purchasers and Qualitex, and infringing Qualitex's registered trademark for the green-gold color. Finally, the court held that Jacobson was also guilty of unfair competition because Jacobson had infringed Qualitex's trade dress.

The district court's order provided that Qualitex was entitled to an injunction against Jacobson's infringement of the registered trademark and the trade dress, and against the unfair competition. Jacobson was also held liable for the

profits it made from its infringement. The court did not award enhanced damages and attorney's fees because Jacobson's copying had been done under the reasonable belief that Qualitex could not appropriate a color.

II.

A claim of federal trademark infringement may be brought against one who, without the permission of the holder of the registered trademark, use[s] in commerce any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of a registered mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, distribution, or advertising of any goods or services on or in connection with which such use is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive....

15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a); *see also Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin*, 846 F.2d 1175, 1178 (9th Cir. 1988).

While this case was pending, Qualitex applied to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office for a Certificate of Registration, granted on February 6, 1991. The registration states in part:

> For machine parts: namely, press pads and covers for press pads for commercial and industrial presses....
>
> The drawing is lined for the color gold.
>
> The mark consists of a particular shade of green-gold applied to the top and side surfaces of the goods.

Certificate of Registration No. 1,633,711.

A certificate of registration is prima facie evidence of the validity of the mark and relieves the holder, Qualitex, of the burden of proving nonfunctionality and secondary meaning. 16 U.S.C. § 1067(b). It shifts the burden of proof to the contesting party, who must introduce

sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption of the holder's right to protected use. See Vuitton et Fils S v. J. Young Enterprises, Inc., 644 F.2d 769, 776 [212 USPQ 86] (9th Cir. 1981). Jacobson contends that it met that burden by showing that Qualitex's green-gold color alone is not protectable, and that the trademark is invalid.

III.

The district court ruled that Jacobson infringed on Qualitex's registered trademark, the green-gold color of the press pads. A district court's findings of facts are reviewed for clear error. *See Clamp Mfg Co. v. Enco Mfg Co.*, 870 F.2d 612, 614 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 872 (1989). Whether color per se qualifies for trademark protection is a legal question to be reviewed de novo. See id. ("[i]ssues concerning the correct test to be used in evaluating trademark infringement are reviewed de novo").

Registration of mere color is not explicitly barred by the Lanham Act, which provides that "[n]o trademark by which the goods of the applicant may be distinguished from the goods of others shall be refused registration," 15 U.S.C. § 1052, unless one of the specific exceptions to registrability set forth in 15 U.S.C. § 1052 applies. Color is not listed as an exception. *See In re Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp.*, 774 F.2d 1116, 1119 (Fed. Cir. 1985). However, the courts of appeals generally have refused to grant trademark protection for color alone. *See Owens-Corning*, 774 F.2d at 1128 & n.2, 1129 (Bissell, J., dissenting) (collecting circuit decisions denying trademark protection for color alone); 1 J. Thomas McCarthy, *Trademarks & Unfair Competition* §§ 7:16, 7:17 (2d ed. 1984) (color per se, unconfined by any defined design, generally cannot be the subject of a trademark; the use of one color as the color of a product usually does not have trademark significance).

A divided panel of the Federal Circuit held that in the unusual circumstances presented by Owens-Corning,

where vast sums had been expended in advertising their pink insulation through the "Pink Panther" ads, and where there was no competitive need for the color pink, a trademark for that color was properly registered as a trademark. *Owens-Corning*, 774 F.2d at 1128.

In a more recent decision, the Eighth Circuit refused to establish a per se rule prohibiting the registration of color as a trademark. *Master Distributors, Inc. v. Pako Corp.*, 986 F.2d 219, 223 (8th Cir. 1993). In *Master Distributors*, the district court held, as a matter of law, that color alone could not be protected as a trademark. The court of appeals reversed, declining to establish that as a matter of law a color alone could not be protected. The court ruled that if a party can establish all the normal trademark requirements arising from the color of its product, the party can register that color as a trademark. *Id.* at 224.

The majority of the other circuits have refused to give a color the protection of a registered trademark. The Seventh Circuit recently affirmed its rule that the overall color of a product cannot be a trade identity designation, and is not entitled to registration. *See NutraSweet Co. v. Stadt Corp.*, 917 F.2d 1024, 1027 (7th Cir. 1990), *cert. denied*, 499 U.S. 983 (1991). *NutraSweet* held that color alone cannot be protected as a trademark, although it may be protected if used "in connection with some symbol or design or impressed in a particular design." *Id.* at 1027.

NutraSweet claimed trade-dress infringement under section 43(a) when another company began marketing tabletop sweetener in a blue packet that was similar, but not identical, to the shade of blue used by NutraSweet for its tabletop sweetener. *Id.* at 1026. The court noted that the appropriation of particular colors could lead to questions of shade confusion, and stated that granting to NutraSweet a protectable interest in pastel blue "might create a barrier to otherwise lawful competition in the tabletop sweetener market." *Id.* at 1028. The court declined to adopt "a fact-driven standard which would require the trial court to scrutinize the tabletop sweetener market to determine the

number of competitors and the likelihood of future competitors in that market to determine whether there is a competitive need for the color blue to remain available." *Id.* Thus, the Seventh Circuit refused to recognize any protectable interest in color alone.

We discussed the question of whether color alone could be validly registered as trademark in *First Brands Corp. v. Fred Mayer, Inc.*, 809 F.2d 1378 (9th Cir. 1987), in the context of a trade dress case. We noted that when "[c]onfronted with an unusual set of facts the court in *Owens-Corning* established a very limited rule that in certain situations a particular color could itself be registered as a trademark." *Id.* at 1382. We did not adopt the *Owens-Corning* rule, as we were merely referring to it in the context of a trade dress case, where we ultimately held that a yellow ordinarily shaped antifreeze container was not protectable trade dress. *Id.* at 1381, 1385.

[1] In this case, we confront the issue of whether to follow the majority of circuits in holding that color alone cannot form the basis for a trademark, or to acknowledge the exception of *Owens-Corning*. We conclude that the better rule is that a trademark should not be registered for color alone. As many cases have noted, under the color depletion theory, no person should have a monopoly on a primary color. We recognize that there are countless shades of colors that could not be depleted, but then, we could well become involved in "shade confusion" as noted in *NutraSweet*, 917 F.2d at 1027, and in Judge Bissell's dissent in *Owens-Corning*, 774 F.2d at 1131. Drawing distinctions - between close shades of color could present unnecessary problems. Adequate protection is available when color is combined in distinctive patterns or designs or combined in distinctive logos. *See Vision Sports, Inc. v. Melville Corp.*, 888 F.2d 609, 613 (9th Cir. 1989). Furthermore, as we discuss hereafter, further protection is afforded by the Lanham Act's unfair competition provisions.

IV.

The basic test for unfair competition is whether consumer confusion or deception is likely as a result of the defendant's acts. *Century 21*, 846 F.2d at 1178. Registration of a trademark is not a prerequisite for recovery under section 43(a), but a party must have a "reasonable interest to be protected." *New West Corp. v. NYM Co. of California, Inc.*, 595 F.2d 1194, 1198 (9th Cir. 1979), *quoted* in *Smith v. Montoro*, 648 F.2d 602, 605 (9th Cir. 1981); *see also Metric & Multistandard Components Corp. v. Metrc's, Inc.*, 635 F.2d 710, 714 (8th Cir. 1980) (a mark not entitled to trademark protection may be entitled to unfair competition protection).

A claim of unfair competition under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act can take many different forms. Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act states:

> (a)(1) Any person who, on or in connection with any goods or services, or any container for goods, uses in commerce any word, term, name, symbol, or device, or combination thereof, or any false designation of origin, false or misleading description of fact, or false or misleading representation of fact, which
>
> (A) is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of such person with another person, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of his or her goods, services, or commercial activities by another person ...shall be liable in a civil action by any person who believes that he or she is or is likely to be damaged by such act.

15 U.S.C. § 1125 .... Traditionally, many courts restricted claims for unfair competition to situations where there was "passing off," which is the selling of a good of one's own creation under the name or mark of another. *See Smith*, 648 F.2d at 604. "Express passing off occurs when an enterprise labels goods or services with a mark identical to that of another enterprise, or otherwise expressly misrepresents that the goods originated with another enterprise." *Id*. However, a claim of unfair competition under section 43(a) is no longer limited to cases of passing off. Professor McCarthy has noted that:

> most courts [today] recognize that passing off is merely a single type of theory within the broad spectrum of unfair competition law. Today, the law of Unfair Competition and Trademarks has progressed far beyond the old concept of fraudulent passing off, to encompass any form of competition or selling which contravenes society's current concepts of "fairness"....

2 McCarthy 25:1, 233 (footnotes omitted). In *Smith v. Montoro*, we expressly adopted the same view. 648 F.2d at 604.

[2] Another way a party may be guilty of unfair competition under section 43(a) is a "trade dress" infringement. The trade dress of a product is its overall image as it is presented to the consumer and includes aspects such as the size, shape, color, or design of the product. *See NutraSweet*, 917 F.2d at 1027 n.7; 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a). For a successful trade-dress claim, the plaintiff must show that its trade dress is protectable and that the defendant's use of similar trade dress is likely to confuse customers. *See Vision Sports*, 888 F.2d at 613. There are yet other ways of violating section 43(a), such as by using

false or misleading geographical terms. As we noted in *New West*:

> [T]he ultimate test [under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act] is whether the public is likely to be deceived or confused by the similarity of the marks. Whether we call the violation infringement, unfair competition or false designation of origin, the test is identical--is there a "likelihood of confusion?

New West, 595 F.2d at 1201 (citations omitted).

Trade-dress infringement is proved by showing (1) the trade dress is nonfunctional, (2) it has acquired secondary meaning, and (3) there is a likelihood of confusion between the products. *First Brands*, 809 F.2d at 1381; *Vision Sports*, 888 F.2d at 613. In a trade-dress infringement claim, the trier of fact must look at the "total impression of the package, size, shape, color, design, and name" to determine if it is likely to confuse the consumer as to the origin of the product. 1 McCarthy 2:2 (quoting *Jean Patou, Inc., v. Jacqueline Cochran, Inc*, 201 F. Supp. 861 (S.D.N.Y. 1962), *aff'd*, 312 F.2d 125 (2d Cir. 1963)); *Vision Sports*, 888 F.2d at 613. In other words, whereas in a registered trademark infringement case, the court must look at a single aspect of the product -- the trademark itself -- a court in an trade-dress infringement case must look at the product as a whole. Therefore, it is possible to succeed on a suit for unfair competition even when there is no registered trademark to begin with or even if no aspect of the package, taken alone, is registrable as a trademark. *Id.*

[3] The district court determined that the "total impression" of the Qualitex green-gold pad and its "SUN GLOW" name constituted the trade dress, or overall appearance, of the Qualitex product. The court found that Qualitex had shown that the trade dress was nonfunctional, had acquired secondary meaning, and was likely to be

confused with the trade dress of Jacobson's product. We review the district court's findings on the elements of nonfunctionality, secondary meaning, and likelihood of confusion for clear error. *Clamp Mfg. Co.*, 870 F.2d at 514. We will not disturb the district court's decision unless, after reviewing all of the evidence, we are left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed. *Id.* We conclude that the district court did not err in holding that Jacobson infringed on Qualitex's trade dress.

First, the district court found that the trade dress of the "SUN GLOW" press pad was nonfunctional. If a feature is functional, it is not protectable under the law of unfair competition. *First Brands*, 809 F.2d at 1381. "A product feature is functional if it is essential to the use or purpose of the article or if it affects the cost or quality of the article." *Inwood Laboratories, Inc. v. Ives Laboratories, Inc.*, 456 U.S. 844, 850 n.10 (1982); *see also Vuitton et Fils S.A.*, 644 F.2d at 773 (reversing district court's order invalidating registered trademark, and remanding for trial on the functionality issue).

The district court found that Qualitex's use of the green-gold color was aesthetic only; was not related in any way to the product's use, cost, quality, or longevity; was used to associate the color with the "SUN GLOW" press pads; and was more expensive than other colors. The district court found that the green-gold color was ornamental and did not make the pad perform any better than if any other color was used. Although evidence was presented that there may be a functional reason to have colored press pads to maintain a clean appearance, we conclude that it was not error for the district court to conclude that "there is no competitive need for the green-gold color, since other colors are equally usable" and that "the range of tones of available distinctive suitable colors ... is in the hundreds if not thousands."

Second, the district found that the trade dress of the press pad had acquired secondary meaning. A product

has secondary meaning if purchasers in that product's market associate the trade dress of the product with a particular source. *See Clamp*, 870 F.2d at 517. The factors to be assessed in determining secondary meaning are whether actual purchasers associate the press pads' trade dress with Qualitex, the degree and manner of Qualitex's use of the trade dress, and whether Qualitex's use of the trade dress has been exclusive. *See id.* at 517; *Vision Sports*, 888 F.2d at 615. Evidence that the manufacturer has used and advertised the product over a substantial period of time is sufficient to establish secondary meaning. *Clamp*, 870 F.2d at 517 (citing *First Brands*, 809 F.2d at 1383). Proof that another party intentionally copied the trade dress strongly supports a finding of secondary meaning. *Vision Sports*, 888 F.2d at 615.

Qualitex presented evidence that its customers have come to rely on the appearance of the "SUN GLOW" pad and to associate that appearance with Qualitex and Qualitex's reputation of producing a high-quality longer-lasting product. The evidence showed: Qualitex has sold its "SUN GLOW" press pad with a green-gold color for over 30 years. The company has spent over $1.6 million in advertising and promoting its press pads in magazines and at trade shows, and nearly all advertising and promotion have highlighted the green-gold color of the pad. Qualitex has run advertisements featuring the press pad's green-gold color on a monthly basis for the last 30 years in a leading magazine aimed at the dry cleaner market. There was evidence that readers of a trade publication associated the green-gold color with Qualitex. Further, Jacobson admitted intentionally copying the overall look of Qualitex's green-gold press pad. Thus, there was convincing evidence that the trade dress had acquired secondary meaning as a result of its long exclusive use by Qualitex.

Third, the court found that the sale of the Jacobson pad had created the likelihood of confusion, deception or mistake in the marketplace. Factors that may be considered in determining a likelihood of confusion

include the strength of the mark, the similarity of the mark, the class of goods and marketing channels, evidence of actual confusion, the intent of the second user, the degree of care likely to be exercised by the purchaser, and the likelihood of expansion of the product lines. *See Eclipse Assoc. Ltd v. Data General Corp.*, 894 F.2d 1114, 1117-18 (9th Cir. 1990); *AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats*, 99 F.2d 341, 348-49 (9th Cir. 1979). These factors are nonexclusive guidelines and are not to be applied as a rigid formula. *Eclipse*, 894 F.2d at 1118.

The district court found that Jacobson intentionally copied the appearance of the "SUN GLOW" pad, and had put an inferior product into the marketplace under Qualitex's distinctive trade dress to the detriment of Qualitex and purchasers. Jacobson's president and vice president testified that they deliberately copied the Qualitex pad cover.

The district court also found that there was a high degree of similarity between the products. Jacobson used exactly the same green-gold color as Qualitex. At trial, Qualitex showed that Jacobson stamps "MAGIC GLOW" on the side or skirt portion of the press-pad cover, which is the same portion of the pad where Qualitex stamps "SUN GLOW."

The degree of care likely to be exercised by the consumer also supported a finding of likelihood of confusion. Qualitex presented evidence that many purchasers do not speak or read English well. The court found that many "foreign speaking purchasers of press pads are unlikely to exercise a sufficiently high degree of care to avoid purchasing a Jacobson pad when they are shown a green-gold pad."

As to actual confusion, Qualitex presented evidence of a survey. In that survey, when people in the dry cleaning industry were shown a Jacobson press pad and asked to identify the manufacturer, 39% responded that it was a Qualitex pad, while not a single respondent answered that it was a Jacobson pad.

[4] We find ample evidence in the record to conclude that the district court did not err in finding the necessary elements of a trade-dress infringement claim under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act and concluding that Jacobson violated that section. We uphold the injunction.

Because we have found a violation of section 43(a) under a theory of trade-dress infringement, we do not address the passing-off claim. We note that the remedy for a violation of section 43(a) is the same regardless of the theory involved.

V.

The judgment for Qualitex on its claim for unfair competition, together with the monetary damages awarded, and the injunction against further infringement are affirmed. The judgment for Qualitex on its claim for trademark infringement and the judgment on Jacobson's counterclaim for cancellation of the trademark are reversed, and the district court is directed to enter judgment for Jacobson on its counterclaim.

AFFIRMED in part, and REVERSED in part, and REMANDED.

APPENDIX G-REVISED JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA ENTERED JUNE 10, 1994

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

QUALITEX COMPANY, an Illinois corporation,	)	No. CV 90 1183 HLH(JRX)
Plaintiff,	)	
JACOBSON PRODUCTS COMPANY INCORPORATED, a California corporation,	)	REVISED JUDGMENT
Defendant.	)	Place: Courtroom 7 Hon. Harry L. Hupp

THE COURT having received the Judgment and mandate from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit dated January 3, 1994 directing this court to cancel plaintiff's registered Trademark No. 1,633,711 with the United States Patent and Trademark Office;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Judgment entered herein on September 3, 1991 are vacated and in lieu thereof the following are entered:

6. Judgment is entered in favor of the defendant and against the plaintiff on the Third Cause of Action in the Supplemental Complaint for infringement of plaintiff's registered trademark for the green-gold color on press pads.

7. Judgment is entered in favor of the defendant and counterclaimant Jacobson Products Co., Inc. and against plaintiff and counterdefendant Qualitex

Company on defendant's Counterclaim for cancellation of Registration No. 1,633,711.

In all other respects the Judgment of September 3, 1991 shall remain the same.

DATED: May __, 1994

UNITED STATES
DISTRICT JUDGE

Presented by:

/s/ Donald G. Mulack
Donald G. Mulack
Attorney For Plaintiff
QUALITEX COMPANY

Approved as to form:

/s/ Laurence D. Strick
Laurence D. Strick
Attorney For Defendant
JACOBSON PRODUCTS COMPANY

APPENDIX H - ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT GRANTING CERTIORARI, ENTERED SEPTEMBER 23, 1994

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 93-1577

Qualitex Company,

Petitioner,

v.

Jacobson Products Company, Inc.

Respondent.

ORDER ALLOWING CERTIORARI. Filed September 26, 1994.

The petition herein to a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted limited to Question 1 presented by the petition. The brief of petitioner is to be filed with the Clerk and served upon opposing counsel on or before 3 p.m., Tuesday, November 8, 1994. The brief of respondent is to be filed with the Clerk and served upon opposing counsel on or before 3 p.m., Tuesday, December 6, 1994. A reply brief, if any, is to be filed with the Clerk and served upon opposing counsel on or before 3 p.m., Tuesday, December 20, 1994. Rule 29.2 does not apply.

September 26, 1994